Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/930,482	DRISKELL, STACY JEAN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Donald Heckenberg	1722
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) William Gosz (Applicant's Rep.).	(3)	
(2) <u>Donald Heckenberg (PTO Exmr.)</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 22 May 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: 22-25		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
M		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		
(Examiner) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative St	gnature – ii appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Exmr. Heckenberg noted that it appeared that inadvertent change had been made to dependency of claims 22-25 in the amendment filed 16 March 2006 and suggested amendment to correct problem arisen with claim 22, and change claims 23-25 back to original form. Mr. Gosz agreed (see Examiner's Amendment).